

Indiana Pro Bono Commission

230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200 Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation

230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200 Indianapolis, IN 46204

COMBINED 2003 DISTRICT REPORT, 2005 PRO BONO GRANT APPLICATION, AND 2005 PLAN

Pro Bono District: 7

Applicant: DISTRICT 7 PRO BONO CORPORATION

Mailing Address: DIVISION 2, COURTHOUSE, 33 SOUTH THIRD STREET

City: TERRE HAUTE, IN Zip: 47807

Phone: 812-462-3238 Fax: 812-232-4650

E-mail address: philadler2@aol.com Website address: N/A

Judicial Appointee: PHILLIP I. ADLER

Plan Administrator: CARRIE MCKILLIP

Names of Counties Served: CLAY, PARKE, PUTNAM, SULLIVAN,

VERMILLION, VIGO

Number of registered attorneys in county: ---- in district: (see next page)

Percentage of volunteer attorneys who accepted a pro bono case in 2003 per registered attorneys in county: ---- in district: (see next page)

Percentage of volunteer attorneys who have not yet accepted a pro bono case in 2003 per registered attorneys in county: ---- in district: (see next page)

Amount of grant received for 2004: \$ 9,000

Amount of grant (2003 & prior yrs) projected to be unused as of 12/31/04: \$8,900

Amount requested for 2005: \$13,000

1

Number of registered attorneys in counties within District 7:

Clay	17	Parke	13	Putnam	25
Sullivan	19	Vermillion	11	Vigo	171

TOTAL NUMBER OF REGISTERED ATTORNEYS IN DISTRICT 7: 256

<u>Percentage of volunteer attorneys who accepted a pro bono case in 2003 per registered attorneys in counties within District 7:</u>

Clay	17.6%	Parke	30.7%	Putnam	8.0%
Sullivan	21.0%	Vermillion	21.0%	Vigo	45.0%

PERCENTAGE WITHIN THE DISTRICT: 30.8%

<u>Percentage of volunteer attorneys who have not yet accepted a pro bono case in</u> 2003 per registered attorneys in counties within District 7:

NOTE: The following statistics for this request are based upon the explanation in Monica Fennell's memo of 3/9/04 wherein it stated, "the Commission is interested in learning about the number of attorneys who have *indicated a willingness* to take a case but who did not actually take a case in 2003."

For instance, in 2003 Vigo County had 77 attorneys signed up for pro bono. 20 of these attorneys did not accept a case in 2003 (25.9%)

In Putnam there were 2 attorneys in 2003 signed up for pro bono and both accepted a case in 2003 (100%).

Clay	100.0%	Parke	100.0%	Putnam	100.0%
Sullivan	33.3%	Vermillion	100.0%	Vigo	25.9%

PERCENTAGE WITHIN THE DISTRICT: 23.4%

Within District 7 for 2003 we had 94 attorneys signed up for pro bono and 22 of those attorneys did not accept a case in 2003 (23.4%).

PRO BONO DISTRICT NUMBER 7 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION

The following representations, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

Operation under Rule 6.5

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to Rule 6.5 of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within the our district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to Rule 6.5 (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to Rule 6.5 (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results;
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission; and

E. forward to the Pro Bono Commission for review and consideration any requests which were presented as formal proposals to be included in the district plan but were rejected by the district committee, provided the group asks for review by the Pro Bono Commission.

Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

- 1. Participation by the local bar associations and attorneys. The associations and attorneys believe the program is necessary and beneficial.
- 2. Centrality of client needs. The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available.
- 3. **Program priorities.** The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal providers and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.
- **4. Direct representation component.** The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.
- 5. Coordination with state and local civil legal providers and bar associations. The programs work cooperatively with the local civil legal providers. The partnerships between the civil legal providers and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.
- 6. Accountability. The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.
- **7. Continuity.** The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff.
- **8. Cost-effectiveness.** The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.

- **9. Minimization of barriers.** The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.
- **10.** Understanding of ethical considerations. The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.
- **11. ABA Standards.** The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request. We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:

It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.

Signatures:

Judicial Appointee Signature	Date
Plan Administrator Signature	Date

2005 PLAN SUMMARY

1. Please write a brief summary of the 2005 grant request. Please include information regarding your district's planned activities. The grant request should cover needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, anticipated outcomes, and how past difficulties will be addressed.

Since District 7's Pro Bono Office opened in March 2001 our goal has been to provide free civil legal representation to income eligible citizens within the district. Our 2005 grant request is based upon that goal with the fervent hope to continue the successes we have achieved in the past, as well as to build upon them.

At the end of 2004, we estimate that we will have \$8,900 in our account. Our 2005 budget is realistic and is bare-bones. We are requesting \$13,000 for 2005. We have accumulated surpluses these past years because we received more money than requested the first two years.

The Council on Domestic Abuse, Inc. will continue to provide the administrative and clerical services for the program, with CODA outreach staff taking applications in Sullivan, Clay, Vigo, Parke and Vermillion, and Putnam County Family Support Service taking applications for Putnam County.

It is anticipated that 150 low income clients will receive legal assistance in 2005 who would not otherwise receive assistance.

The major difficulty confronted by District 7 Pro Bono Corporation is the lack of attorneys willing to take family law cases. The number of family la specialists is declining and those attorneys who have not practiced family law feel uncomfortable doing so. During 2003 and 2004, some success has been achieved by having attorneys call and recruit other attorneys. This will be continued as well as ongoing attorney recruitment through mailings and bar association meetings.

Another family law seminar may be scheduled if there appears to be enough interest. One was conducted March 8, 2002.

In 2005 we will, as we did in December 2003, conduct a district-wide recognition dinner for all participating pro bono attorneys. All attorneys and judges within the district will be invited. The recognition dinner will also serve as a recruitment event.

2003 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER LAWYER CASES IN DISTRICT 7

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 6A. Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer lawyer column but complete one line for each pro bono case for that attorney.

Definitions:

<u>Case</u>: A legal matter referred to and accepted by a pro bono attorney volunteer. <u>Volunteer Lawyer</u>: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program. This does not include attorneys who are on the list of pro bono volunteers but who have never taken a case. The case numbers do not include cases screened, only cases actually referred to a pro bono attorney.

<u>Case Type</u>: Please use the abbreviations listed in Indiana Supreme Court Administrative Rule 8(B)(3)

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): District 7 Pro Bono Corporation

IOLTA funding accounts for 100% of total pro bono provider budget.

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
	\## *				
ABEL, ERIC	VIGO	2003	2003	8	DR
"	VIGO	2003	2003	*	AD
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
44	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
44	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
££	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
ANDERSON, JOSEPH	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
ANTONINI, HENRY	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	AD
BERRY, MARGARET	CLAY	2003	2003	1	DR
BODINE, JOHN	SULLIVAN	2003	2003	5	DR
"	SULLIVAN	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
BONOMO, DONALD	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
BOUGH, BRAD	VIGO	2003	2003	5	GU
44	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU

6 (7 pages)

unteer County	Year Case Ye	ear Number Case Type
---------------	--------------	----------------------

Lawyer Name		Accepted	Case Closed	of Hours	
BOYLL, JEFFREY	CLAY	2003	2003	*	DR
44	CLAY	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
BRAMES, ARNOLD	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
BRATTAIN, GEORGE	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	WILL
44	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	WILL
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
COOK, ADAM	VIGO	2003	2003	*	GU
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
44	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	SC
CRAIG, SCOTT	SULLIVAN	2003	2003	.7	GU
CRAWFORD, JAMES	VIGO	2003	2003	3	DR
"	VIGO	2003	2003	*	DR
44	VIGO	2003	2003	*	DR
44	VIGO	2002	2003	*	WILL
CREASON, GEOFF	VIGO	2001	2003	8	DR
44	PUTNAM	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
44	PUTNAM	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
44	SULLIVAN	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VERMILLION	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
CROSSEN, MARTHA	CLAY	2003	2003	1	WILL
44	VIGO	2003	2003	0	GU
44	VIGO	2003	2003	0	DR
44	VIGO	2003	2003	*	DR
"	CLAY	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
DAILEY, CHRIS	SULLIVAN	2003	2003	.25	BNKRPTCY
"	CLAY	2003	2003	6	DR
"	CLAY	2003	2003	4.75	DR
44	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	MI
DANBERRY, CHERYL	PUTNAM	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PUTNAM	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PUTNAM	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PUTNAM	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PUTNAM	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
Volunteer	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case	Number of	Case Type

Lawyer Name			Closed	Hours	
DARNELL, DON	PARKE	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PARKE	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	PARKE	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PARKE	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
44	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
DEAL, JAMES	PUTNAM	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
DRUMMY, WILLIAM	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	SC
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
EFFNER, ROBERT	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
ELLIS, KALEEL	VIGO	2002	2003	15	DR
"	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	BENEFITS
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
ELLIS, MICHAEL	VIGO	2003	N/A	10	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	MI
66	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2002	2003	8	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	MI
ETLING, JOSEPH	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
FLESCHNER, STEVEN	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	AD
FOLLOWELL, DOUG	SULLIVAN	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
FREY, ERIC	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
44	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	BENEFITS
FRIEDRICH, DAVID	PARKE	2003	2003	5	GU
44	VERMILLION	2002	2003	4	DR
44	PARKE	2003	2003	10	GU
44	VIGO	2003	2003	4	GU
44	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
GAMILL, CHRIS	VIGO	2002	2003	3	DR
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
HANNER, GARY	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PARKE	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
44	VERMILLION	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
HANNER, JAMES	VERMILLION	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case	Number of	Case Type

			Closed	Hours	
"	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
HELLMAN, ROBERT	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	GU
HIMES, JOHN	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
IRELAND, MICHAEL	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
JOHNSON, JEFFREY	SULLIVAN	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
KESLER II, JOHN	VIGO	2003	2003	1	AD
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
LEE, CHOUIL	VIGO	202	N/A	N/A	AD
LEWELLYN, JEFFREY	VIGO	2001	2003	*	GU
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
LEWIS, ELIZABETH	VERMILLION	2002	2003	0	DR
"	VIGO	2003	2003	1.65	DR
44	VIGO	2003	2003	1.8	PATRNTY
"	CLAY	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	CLAY	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
44	CLAY	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	SULLIVAN	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
44	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
LIND, JEFFRY	VIGO	2003	2003	8	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
LORENZ, TERI	VIGO	2003	2003	*	AD
44	VIGO	2001	2003	24.45	PATRNTY
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	AD
44	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
MARTIN, RAE	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	WILL
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
MCDONALD, MISTY	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
MCGLONE, DANIEL	VIGO	2003	2003	8	SC
"	CLAY	202	N/A	N/A	AD
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BENEFITS
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
MCGLONE, GERALD	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	GU
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	SC
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
MCKEE, CRAIG	VIGO	2003	2003	.5	BENEFITS
Volunteer Lawyer Name		Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type

66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	NAME CH
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
MCMAHAN, ROBERT	VIGO	2003	2003	*	POA/WILL
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
MULLICAN, MARK	VIGO	2002	2003	10	DR
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
NEWLIN, THOMAS	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
NEWTON, CHRIS	VIGO	2003	2003	*	GU
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
66	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
NICHOLS, JOHN	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
OLDHAM, RHONDA	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	ES
ORGAN, JAMES	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
PHIPPS, LORA	CLAY	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
PIERCE, MARY	VERMILLION	2003	2003	*	DR
"	PARKE	2003	2003	*	DR
66	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	AD
66	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VERMILLION	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKPRTCY
66	VERMILLION	2002	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
REED, MARK	SULLIVAN	2002	2003	3	GU
"	SULLIVAN	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
66	SULLIVAN	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
SACOPULOS, PETER	VIGO	2002	2003	*	GU
SHAGLEY II, RICH-	VIGO	2003	2003	1	DR
ARD	1100	2000	2000	•	
"	VIGO	2002	2003	**	DR
SHAGLEY, RICK	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	SC
SHEMA, CHRISTO-	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	AD
PHER					
SIMBOL, NELLIE	VIGO	2003	2003	0	DR
Volunteer	County	Year Case	Year	Number	Case Type
Lawyer Name		Accepted	Case	of	
			Closed	Hours	
66	VIGO	2003	2003	4	AD
SKILLMAN, B. SCOTT	VIGO	2003	2003	.5	BNKRPTCY

66	VIGO	2002	2003	3	SC
66	VIGO	2002	2003	13	DR
66	PARKE	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
SLAGLE, MIKE	CLAY	2003	2003	3	DR
"	VERMILLION	2003	2003	0	DR
66	VIGO	2003	2003	0	DR
"	CLAY	2002	2003	0	DR
"	CLAY	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
SMELTZER, CAR- ROLL	VIGO	2003	2003	*	DR
66	VIGO	2003	2003	*	DR
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
SMITH, PHILLIP	VIGO	2002	2003	1.5	GU
66	VIGO	2003	2003	.25	POA
66	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	ES
STARK, DENNIS	VIGO	2002	2003	6	DR
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
SULLIVAN, DAVID	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	AD
SWAIM, SAME	PARKE	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
"	PARKE	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	PUTNAM	2003	N/A	N/A	GU
TANOOS, TONY	VIGO	2003	2003	*	MI
"	CLAY	2001	N/A	N/A	BENEFITS
TROUT, JOSEPH	CLAY	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
WAGNER, LARRY	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
WATSON, MARK	CLAY	2003	2003	*	DR
"	CLAY	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	CLAY	2001	N/A	N/A	DR
66	PARKE	2001	N/A	N/A	SC
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
Volunteer	County	Year Case	Year	Number	Case Type
Lawyer Name		Accepted	Case	of	
•			Closed	Hours	
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
66	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
66	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY

WILKINSON, CURTIS	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	GU
WILLIAMS, ROWDY	CLAY	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VERMILLION	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	DR
"	VIGO	2003	N/A	N/A	BNKRPTCY
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
WREDE, CHRIS	VIGO	2003	2003	*	DR
"	VIGO	2002	N/A	N/A	DR
WREDE, JENNIFER	VIGO	2003	2003	0	DR
"	VIGO	2002	2003	10	AD
"	VIGO	2003	2003	N/A	DR
YOUNG, JAMES	PUTNAM	2003	2003	9	DR
TOTAL:		TOTAL:		TOTAL:	
OVERALL TOTAL: 79		OVERALL	236	OVERALL	210.85
		TOTAL:	CASES	TOTAL:	HOURS

^{*}We received initial Disposition Forms indicating that these clients failed to contact the attorney. We do not know how much time the attorneys spent reviewing the files or trying to contact the client.

2003 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER LAWYER LIMITED INFORMATION ACTIVITY IN DISTRICT 7

This limited legal information chart can include activities such as pro se clinics and callin or walk-in informational services.

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 7A. Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer lawyer column but complete one line for each type of legal information activity for that attorney.

Name of Pro Bono Provider	(includes legal	service provider,	court, plan	administrator,
bar association, and other orga	anizations):			

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Type of Activity	Number of Hours
TOTAL:			TOTAL:
OVERALL TOTAL:			OVERALL

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations):

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Type of Activity	Number of Hours

2003 REPORT

Please list your District's 2003 activities--including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, marketing and promotion--in chronological order.

Date Activity

Jan-Dec

Throughout the year Judge Adler informally met with various board members, attorneys and judges, relative to recruiting participating pro bono attorneys. He also met throughout the year with the plan administrator and the pro bono office manager and the corporation's treasurer, John Roach. He visited the Pro Bono Office at least twice a month. Brochures and posters were distributed throughout the district when needed. Judge Adler sent a personal thank you letter to each participating attorney once a case was closed.

Although the dates are unknown, Karen Nielson of LSO contacted Judge Adler concerning the coordination of a pro se clinic. Judge Adler offered to speak at the clinic as well as to donate his courtroom for the location of the pro se clinic. Unfortunately, Karen Nielson of LSO has left that position, and Judge Adler has not been contacted by anyone since her departure.

- Oct 24 District 7's Plan Administrator, Carrie McKillip, attended a plan administrator's retreat.
- Nov 19 District 7 conducted a full board meeting with Judge Adler, President, presiding.
- Nov 24 Attorney and charter District 7 board member, Mike Ellis, spent three hours at the Pro Bono Office recruiting attorneys for pro bono. He assigned 31 cases.
- Dec 1 Attorney and charter District 7 board member, Mike Ellis, spent three hours at the Pro Bono Office recruiting attorneys for pro bono. He assigned 28 cases.

2003 REPORT

Please provide a short summary of how the provision of pro bono service is coordinated in your district, including the intake process, the relationships of pro bono providers in the district, how referrals are made, and how reporting is done.

When a client contacts the District 7 Pro Bono Office their eligibility is first determined based upon income, location and legal problem. If they are a victim of domestic violence, they are referred to the Indiana Legal Services for assistance. In Putnam County, if the client is willing to file pro se, the client is referred to the Putname County Pro Se Help Desk; we also make referrals to the Putnam County Family Court Facilitation Project which is a project which aids clients in mediating family law cases. If the client does go through our Pro Bono Office, their application is taken and they are placed on a waiting list until their case is up for assignment. At that time we call volunteer participating attorneys until one of them accepts the case. All reporting is done at the conclusion of the case when the attorney and the client submit a case closing report. Once the case is closed Judge Adler personally sends to the attorney a thank you letter.

Please describe any special circumstances, including difficulties encountered, affecting your District's 2003 implementation of its plan.

The only real difficulty District 7 has encountered since 2001 is meeting the overwhelming demand in the area of family law. Approximatley 80% of all requests for pro bono services are in the area of family law. We conducted a family law seiminar in March of 2002 which was quite successful. However, the demand still surpasses the supply of family law participating attorneys.

On November 24 and December 1, 2003, for three hours each morning, charter board member, attorney Mike Ellis, went to the pro bono office for purposes of recruiting attorneys. Due to his tenacity, would not take no for an answer attitude and peer pressure, Mr. Ellis was able to assign 59 cases, many of which were assigned to attorneys who had never accepted a pro bono case. On a Monday in January 2004, Mr. Ellis was able to assign an additional 30 cases. This recruitment initiative will continue with Mr. Ellis, as well as other District 7 board members and interested attorneys, with the hope of achieving similar successes.

Our program has operated quite smoothly with overwhelming favorable comments from clients as well as participating attorneys. To date we have been adequately funded.

BUDGETS FOR 2003, 2004 AND 2005 FOR IOLTA FUNDS ONLY

Cont Cotomore	, ,				
Cost Category	2003 actual expendi-	2003 Budget	2004 actual expendi-	2004 Budget	2005 Budget
	tures		tures		
A. Personnel Costs	101.00				
1. Plan Adminis-	15,000.00	15,000.00	8,750.00	17,500.00	17,500.00
trator	10,000.00	10,000.00	0,700.00	17,000.00	17,000.00
2. Paralegals					
3. Others					
4. Employee					
benefits					
a. Insurance					
b. Retirement					
plans					
c. Other					
5. Total Person-	15,000.00	15,000.00	8,750.00	17,500.00	17,500.00
nel Costs	,	,	,	,	,
B. Non-					
Personnel					
Costs					
1. Occupancy					
2. Equipment					
rental					
Office sup-	433.90	600.00	74.00	400.00	400.00
plies/postage					
4. Telephone/	1,055.00	2,000.00	361.92	2,000.00	1,200.00
Internet					
5. Travel		500.00		400.00	300.00
6. Training		1,500.00		1,200.00	
7. Library					
8. Malpractice					
insurance					
9. Dues and fees					
10. Audit/	330.00	1,000.00	330.00	1 ,000.00	500.00
Accounting					
11. Contingent				7,900.00	
reserve				4.000.00	
12. Litigation re-				1,000.00	
serve					
13. Marketing and					
promotion					000.00
14. Attorney					800.00
recognition					
15. Litigation					

Expenses (in-	1,760.56	7,000.00	211.00	5,000.00	1,200.00
cludes expert					
fees)					
16. Property					
Acquisition					
17. Contract Ser-					
vices					
18. Grants to					
other pro bono					
providers					
19. Other					
20. Total	3,579.46	12,600.00	976.92	18,900.00	4,400.00
Non-Personnel					
Costs					
C. Total	18,579.46	27,600.00	9,726.92	36,400.00	21,900.00
Expenditures					

IOLTA funds received 2003: \$ 5,740.00 IOLTA funds received 2004: \$ 9,000.00

NOTE:

We estimate we will have approximately \$8,900 left in our account at the end of the 2004 calendar year. This amount is reflected on lines 11 and 12 in the 2004 budget column. This is why our 2004 budget total is so high.

Also, our 2004 actual expenditure column reflects what we have spent at the time of this report.

Please provide descriptions of the following line items in the foregoing budget chart, by item number, in the space provided.

Lines (A)(1), (2), (3) Please indicate the number of hours per week for each personnel position and rate of pay.

District 7 has contracted with the Council on Domestic Abuse for \$17,500 per year. Our plan administrator is the director of CODA. They provide all personnel in each county within the district for our pro bono offices, staff each one and provide the necessary services to the clients, which includes taking client applications, contacting attorneys, keeping track of all records and statistics, and all follow-up procedures. They receive no benefits from District 7 or mileage. It is estimated that the CODA personnel spend 42 hours per week on pro bono.

Line (B)(1) Please describe the occupancy cost in terms of square footage, utilities or other amenities and indicate whether the occupancy cost is above or below the market rate for that space.

District 7's main office is located in the Vigo County Courthouse. CODA has generously donated part of their office in the Courthouse to District 7, with the approval of the county commissioners. There is no charge for rent or utilities. CODA also allows District 7 to use their space in all other counties in the district at no cost.

It is estimated that the rental cost for the main Pro Bono Office located in the Vigo County Courthouse alone would be \$500 per month, plus utilities. Judge Adler offers the fax and Xerox machine in his office to pro bono at no charge.

ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS:

January 1: Checks distributed

July 1: Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC

November: Notification of awards

December 1: IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due